



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,509	03/30/2004	Lee W. Sapiro	EMC-042PUS	3249
51576 7590 12/31/2007 EMC CORPORATION c/o DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP 354 TURNPIKE STREET SUITE 301A CANTON, MA 02021-2714			EXAMINER PATEL, HARESH N	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/812,509	SAPIRO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Haresh Patel	2154	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/30/04</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are subject to examination.

### *Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-42 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 10/812,503.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application discloses all the limitations as disclosed such that the interpretation of displaying alert information using performance and alert information is similar to displaying alert information for objects in a network with performance information. The claimed subject matter of claims 1-42 of copending Application does not specifically mention about summary view. However, the use of the summary view is well known in the art. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the concept of

summary view with the claimed subject matter of the claims of copending Application to facilitate display information on the user interface.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

Claims 1-42 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-39 of copending Application No. 10/812,502.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application discloses all the limitations as disclosed such that the interpretation of displaying alert information using performance and alert information is similar to displaying alert information for objects in a network with performance information. The claimed subject matter of claims 1-39 of copending Application does not specifically mention about summary view. However, the use of the summary view is well known in the art. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the concept of summary view with the claimed subject matter of the claims of copending Application to facilitate display information on the user interface.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

Claims 1-42 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 10/869, 807.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application discloses all the limitations as disclosed such that the interpretation of displaying alert information using performance and alert information is similar to displaying network performance information for objects in a network with alert information. The claimed subject matter of claims 1-32 of copending Application does not specifically mention about summary view. However, the use of the summary view is well known in the art. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the concept of summary view with the claimed subject matter of the claims of copending Application to facilitate display information on the user interface.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The present title, ..., providing mapped network object performance information, is too broad and is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed on 7/14/04 are acknowledged.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. An initialed and dated copy of the applicant's IDS form 1449, paper dated 7/30/04, is attached to the instant Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sloth et al. 2005/0027858, PremiTech (Hereinafter Sloth-PremiTech).

7. Referring to claims 1, 19, 31, Sloth-PremiTech discloses a method of displaying alert information in a network, An article, comprising: a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following, a computer system, comprising: a processor; a display coupled to the processor; and a memory coupled to the processor; wherein the memory includes stored instructions that when executed result in the following (e.g., page 4): storing performance information for network objects at predetermined time intervals (e.g., page 4); determining at least one potential root cause of one or more alerts in the network (e.g., page 5); and displaying a summary view including a plurality of cells

corresponding to periods of time, the cells including an alert status indication for the network objects (e.g., page 5).

8. Referring to claims 2, 20, 32, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 4).

9. Referring to claims 3, 33, 21, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 5).

10. Referring to claims 4, 34, 22, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 6).

11. Referring to claims 5, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses wherein the selected ones of the first object type correspond to a user-created group of objects (e.g., page 6).

12. Referring to claims 6, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a first time/date box and a second time/date box, and displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the first time/date box (e.g., page 10).

13. Referring to claims 7, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the second time/date box for comparison to the alert information for the first time/date (e.g., page 10).

14. Referring to claims 8, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses receiving a date selection for the second date (e.g., page 10).

15. Referring to claims 9, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses receiving a user selection of the predetermined interval for performance data collection (e.g., page 5).

16. Referring to claims 10, 25, 37, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses receiving a user selection of the cell time period (e.g., page 4).



17. Referring to claims 11, 38, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status and alert status (e.g., page 4).

18. Referring to claims 12, 26, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status, a medium alert status and a critical alert status (e.g., page 4).

19. Referring to claims 14, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses wherein the particular cell is selected by a user (e.g., page 5).

20. Referring to claims 15, 40, 28, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a graph of performance data for one or more of the network objects (e.g., page 5).

21. Referring to claims 16, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a threshold associated with the performance data for the one or more network objects (e.g., page 5).

22. Referring to claims 17, 29, 41, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying statistical band information for the performance data (e.g., page 6).

23. Referring to claims 18, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses determining at least one root potential root cause of one or more alerts (e.g., page 6).

24. Referring to claims 23, 35, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 10).

25. Referring to claims 24, 36, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 8).

26. Referring to claims 27, 13, 39, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a topographical map including a plurality of regions for displaying respective network object types associated with one or more alerts, the map corresponding to a particular cell in the summary view (e.g., page 5).

27. Referring to claims 30, 42, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying performance data for a metric selected by a user (e.g., page 4).

28. Referring to claims 32, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 4).

29. Referring to claims 33, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 4).

30. Referring to claims 34, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 5).

31. Referring to claims 35, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 5).

32. Referring to claims 36, Sloth-PremiTech discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Sloth-PremiTech also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 5).

33. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nazzal et al. 2004/0261030, Mazu Networks (Hereinafter Nazzal-Mazu-Networks).

34. Referring to claims 1, 19, 31, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses a method of displaying alert information in a network, An article, comprising: a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following, a computer system, comprising: a processor; a display coupled to the processor; and a memory coupled to the processor; wherein the memory includes stored instructions that when executed result in the following (e.g., page 2): storing performance information for network objects at predetermined time intervals (e.g., page 2); determining at least one potential root cause of one or more alerts in the network (e.g., page 14); and displaying a summary view including a plurality of cells corresponding to periods of time, the cells including an alert status indication for the network objects (e.g., page 14).

35. Referring to claims 2, 20,32, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to

a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 2).

36. Referring to claims 3, 33, 21, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 14).

37. Referring to claims 4, 34, 22, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 15).

38. Referring to claims 5, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses wherein the selected ones of the first object type correspond to a user-created group of objects (e.g., page 15).

39. Referring to claims 6, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a first time/date box and a second time/date box, and displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the first time/date box (e.g., page 13).

40. Referring to claims 7, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the second time/date box for comparison to the alert information for the first time/date (e.g., page 13).

41. Referring to claims 8, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses receiving a date selection for the second date (e.g., page 13).

42. Referring to claims 9, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses receiving a user selection of the predetermined interval for performance data collection (e.g., page 14).

43. Referring to claims 10, 25, 37, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses receiving a user selection of the cell time period (e.g., page 2).

44. Referring to claims 11, 38, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status and alert status (e.g., page 2).

45. Referring to claims 12, 26, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status, a medium alert status and a critical alert status (e.g., page 2).

46. Referring to claims 14, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses wherein the particular cell is selected by a user (e.g., page 14).

47. Referring to claims 15, 40, 28, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a graph of performance data for one or more of the network objects (e.g., page 14).

48. Referring to claims 16, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a threshold associated with the performance data for the one or more network objects (e.g., page 14).

49. Referring to claims 17, 29, 41, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying statistical band information for the performance data (e.g., page 15).

50. Referring to claims 18, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses determining at least one root potential root cause of one or more alerts (e.g., page 15).

51. Referring to claims 23, 35, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 13).

52. Referring to claims 24, 36, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 8).

53. Referring to claims 27, 13, 39, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a topographical map including a plurality of regions for displaying respective network object types associated with one or more alerts, the map corresponding to a particular cell in the summary view (e.g., page 14).

54. Referring to claims 30, 42, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying performance data for a metric selected by a user (e.g., page 2).



55. Referring to claims 32, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 2).

56. Referring to claims 33, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 2).

57. Referring to claims 34, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 14).

58. Referring to claims 35, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 14).

59. Referring to claims 36, Nazzal-Mazu-Networks discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Nazzal-Mazu-Networks also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 14).

60. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roletto et al. 2004/0221190, PremiTech (Hereinafter Roletto).

61. Referring to claims 1, 19, 31, Roletto discloses a method of displaying alert information in a network, An article, comprising: a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that when executed by a machine result in the following, a computer system, comprising: a processor; a display coupled to the processor; and a memory coupled to the processor; wherein the memory includes stored instructions that when executed result in the following (e.g., page 2): storing performance information for network objects at predetermined time intervals (e.g., page 2); determining at least one potential root cause of one or more alerts in the network (e.g., page 14); and displaying a summary view including a plurality of cells corresponding to periods of time, the cells including an alert status indication for the network objects (e.g., page 14).

62. Referring to claims 2, 20,32, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 2).

63. Referring to claims 3, 33, 21, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type,

wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 14).

64. Referring to claims 4, 34, 22, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 15).

65. Referring to claims 5, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses wherein the selected ones of the first object type correspond to a user-created group of objects (e.g., page 15).

66. Referring to claims 6, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a first time/date box and a second time/date box, and displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the first time/date box (e.g., page 13).

67. Referring to claims 7, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying alert information for a time period corresponding to the second time/date box for comparison to the alert information for the first time/date (e.g., page 13).

68. Referring to claims 8, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses receiving a date selection for the second date (e.g., page 13).

69. Referring to claims 9, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses receiving a user selection of the predetermined interval for performance data collection (e.g., page 14).

70. Referring to claims 10, 25, 37, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses receiving a user selection of the cell time period (e.g., page 2).

71. Referring to claims 11, 38, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status and alert status (e.g., page 2).

72. Referring to claims 12, 26, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses wherein the alert information includes at least a no alert status, a medium alert status and a critical alert status (e.g., page 2).

73. Referring to claims 14, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses wherein the particular cell is selected by a user (e.g., page 14).

74. Referring to claims 15, 40, 28, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a graph of performance data for one or more of the network objects (e.g., page 14).

75. Referring to claims 16, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above.

Roletto also discloses displaying a threshold associated with the performance data for the one or more network objects (e.g., page 14).

76. Referring to claims 17, 29, 41, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying statistical band information for the performance data (e.g., page 15).

77. Referring to claims 18, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses determining at least one root potential root cause of one or more alerts (e.g., page 15).

78. Referring to claims 23, 35, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 13).

79. Referring to claims 24, 36, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 8).

80. Referring to claims 27, 13, 39, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a topographical map including a plurality of regions for

displaying respective network object types associated with one or more alerts, the map corresponding to a particular cell in the summary view (e.g., page 14).

81. Referring to claims 30, 42, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying performance data for a metric selected by a user (e.g., page 2).

82. Referring to claims 32, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a first region corresponding to a first network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a first series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the first object type (e.g., page 2).

83. Referring to claims 33, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a second region corresponding to a second network object type, wherein the plurality of cells includes a second series of cells providing alert information for one or more objects of the second object type (e.g., page 2).

84. Referring to claims 34, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying alert information for all first object type devices in the first region and for selected ones of the first object type devices (e.g., page 14).

85. Referring to claims 35, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying a first date box and a second date box, and displaying alert information for the first date (e.g., page 14).

86. Referring to claims 36, Roletto discloses the claimed limitations as rejected above. Roletto also discloses displaying alert information for the second date for comparison to the alert information for the first date (e.g., page 14).

### ***Conclusion***

In order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the claims.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

Application/Control Number:  
10/812,509  
Art Unit: 2154

Page 23

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**HARESH PATEL**

**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

12/20/2007